

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 29

A3844

Of all parts of the Ozark ranges the Kiamichis are the wildest, the ruggedest, the most unspoiled. They represent, in fact, the emptiest quarter between the Gulf of Mexico and the upper Minnesota woods. They contained no gold, no oil, no precious minerals. Pioneers, prospectors, cattlemen and homesteaders flowed around them. The narrow valleys drew only a few small farmers and, of course, the Choctaws, who were given this sterile confusion of coulees and crags in exchange for their ancient hunting grounds in southern Mississippi which the white man wanted for cotton.

So today in all the Kiamichi country from Tallihina on the north to Broken Bow on the south, and from Antlers on the west to Mena, Ark. on the east there are no towns. There is no industry save a few country sawmills. There is no smoke, no clatter, no pollution, no ugliness and squalor. The streams run clear. The air is filled with the wine of spring.

Twenty-four miles south of Poteau Highway 59 begins to bend eastward toward Arkansas in a narrow valley between Black Fork Mountain and Rich Mountain. But just beyond the settlement of Stapp we turn sharp right on Highway 103, head back west, climb an escarpment and in 2 or 3 miles there's a sign indicating a narrow, gravel road leading up a mountainside in a tunnel of trees.

"Winding Stair Tower," it says.

Now, Winding Stair Mountain is another ridge and the forest ranger road swerves and twists along its crooked spine for nearly 25 miles. But at the east end is the high point—2,880 feet above sea level. This is the highest point in eastern Oklahoma and it is 80 feet higher than Magazine and Blue Mountains that tie for the honor of the highest points in Arkansas.

A characteristic of southeast Oklahoma is cruel winter sleet. For while the annual rainfall of the far Panhandle is only 10 inches it increases about an inch every 20 miles as you move east-southeast until by the time you get to the Kiamichis you've got more than 40 inches. The tops of these ridges are often scourged by driving winter ice storms and we notice as we climb the steep road toward the ranger's tower that the trees gradually grow stunted, gnarled, and blasted.

But when we clamber up the steel ladder to Winding Stair Tower there is nothing chilly about the reception offered by Ranger H. J. Hickman. The men who man the mountaintops and watch for the telltale smoke wisps that might grow into a holocaust are a friendly breed.

He tells us that his chief worry these days are the spring thunderstorms.

"We're more afraid of them than careless campers," he says. "For a bolt of lightning may char the inside of a tree and the wood may smolder for days before the fire breaks out and gets away. We always keep an eye on the springs and campgrounds where people might gather. But Old Man Lightning uses a scattergun."

West from the Winding Stair Tower the road rides the ridge beneath banks of dogwood, skirting vertical strata and dipping now and then into heavily forested glens. Occasionally the ridge becomes a knife edge and we look down upon valleys on both sides. Then is the time to stop the car, switch off the engine, and listen.

There is nothing to hear. No clash, no discord, no voice, no roar. And there is everything to hear—fresh wind rustling the leaves, a lark's call, the muffled staccato of a woodpecker, the drone of a bumblebee. You look across the valleys. As far as you can see there is nothing but blue hills across which pools of shadow float in stately fashion under the scattered clouds.

At Sycamore Tower on the far west end of Winding Stair Mountain, Ranger H. B.

Blankenship, 23 years in the Forest Service, chews a mouthful of cut plug and tells us of the wildlife.

"If you like animals," he says, "these hills are getting better. We've always had wolves, foxes, and bobcats, but when I first came up here you'd rarely see a deer. Now I rarely go a day without seeing one beneath the tower. One side of this ridge is a game preserve, and on the other side the hunters can't get the deer fast enough. We've got a wildlife paradise building here."

At the far west end of the mountain there is a little clearing and a plaque. Here the old military road from Fort Smith to Fort Towson crossed the ridge. It was laid out in 1832 by Jesse Chisholm who later gave the name to the Chisholm Trail, and over the old road a century ago rattled the Butterfield stagecoaches on their perilous way to the Apache country and California. You look into the thick woods on either side, and, sure enough, there is a ghostly lane in which the oaks are younger and mossy furrows mark the ruts over which prairie schooners once rolled.

Who traveled this trail? Who were the cutthroats, the fugitives, the remittance men? What families made their painful, hopeful way to Texas to die in waterhole feuds or in the horrors of Comanche torture? What young feet marched over this mountain and later back and forth behind a cotton plow and finally to a dead end at the Alamo or Gettysburg?

The old campground is empty and silent. Man has left it almost without a souvenir of his passing. Almost. There is a silver can lying in the grass. "Coors," it says.

Then the mountain ends. We are back on Highway 271, 9 miles east of Tallihina. There are billboards, snorting transport trucks, and here, at last, is a garish country honkytonk. We turn on the radio and a nasal idiot is braying a "rock-a-billy" ballad.

We have left the kingdom of quiet.

Hello, civilization.

Cuba file
Kennedy Cuban Tactics Disturbing to Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, Castro's tractors-for-freedom proposal has aroused a growing volume of mail from Michigan's Sixth District. It is apparent there is a deep feeling of indignation over the Castro proposal.

This proposition is aptly described by the Flint Journal, in an editorial of May 25, as a "cat-and-mouse game," in which Castro is playing the cat and has relegated the United States to the role of mouse. Under permission to extend my remarks, the editorial is reprinted below.

KENNEDY'S CUBAN TACTICS DISTURBING TO COUNTRY

No one can quarrel with the humanitarian instinct which prompted many Americans to accept Fidel Castro's offer to release 1,200 invasion prisoners for 500 American tractors.

However, there can be, and there is, a wide difference of opinion as to the wisdom of doing so.

Bargaining on his own terms with the blood-stained Cuban dictator cannot help but lower American prestige in many parts of the world.

And with typical communist arrogance, Castro fumes over the fact that Americans refer to the deal as an exchange of tractors for prisoners of war. He demands that it be called "indemnity" which we are to pay for the ill-fated invasion of Cuba by Cuban patriots. And he threatens to call the deal off if we don't mend our speech.

Developments in this project also serve again to underline the uncertain behavior of the Kennedy administration. During the Cuban invasion, conflicting reports on U.S. policy poured from top Government officials.

In the tractor project, no less a person than Speaker SAM RAYBURN said Tuesday that "the Government is out of this and is going to stay out."

The next day, however, President Kennedy revealed that he is the one who appointed the committee of three to coordinate efforts in the project.

A presidential press aide then announced that the President's role was strictly that of a private citizen.

But no matter how you slice it, that amounts to formal U.S. approval of the project, and it is in that light that it will be viewed in many parts of the world.

The President revealed he went first to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt to head the committee, then to Walter P. Reuther because of what was termed Reuther's tractor know-how. Finally the President added Dr. Milton Eisenhower to make the board "bipartisan," and that in itself is an odd afterthought.

So Reuther, who has done his best to steer the Nation's economy down some questionable roads, now takes a hand in American foreign policy. No stage, naturally, is too large for Reuther.

Latin American countries must be watching the deal with the greatest interest. And many in those nations are bound to feel that we are bowing to blackmail, even though it is cloaked in humanitarianism.

An interesting aspect of the deal is that Castro already has specified the type of machine he wants. The New York Times reported the dictator wants a D-8 Super, the second-largest earthmoving machine manufactured by one American company. He will take its equivalent from other companies.

The cost of this machine is \$40,000, which brings the whole deal to a total of \$20 million.

The Times quoted Reuther as saying he was "certainly surprised, to put it mildly," at the insistence on this type of tractor because it is designed for major construction projects, not for farming.

We have entered into a cat-and-mouse game with the Cuban dictator, giving him the role of the cat. And already he is playing his role to the hilt. Monday on the Havana radio Castro suddenly demanded return to Cuba of 1,200 political prisoners from various countries rather than the 500 tractors in exchange for the invasion prisoners.

As another example of Castro's arrogance, he specified in the broadcast that Pedro Albizu Campos and Francisco "The Hook" Molina must head the list of political prisoners handed over in exchange for the rebels.

Molina awaits sentence for the fatal shooting of a Venezuelan girl in a New York restaurant last fall in a fight between pro-Castro and anti-Castro Cubans. Albizu Campos is serving time for an armed attack on Blair House in Washington during the Truman administration.

Did the Cuban dictator mean what he said, or was he just indulging in a little sport?

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has said of the deal that he does not believe the Government should lend itself to that kind of blackmail operation.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, asks: "How much more humiliation

not place the burden of our obligations in gold on our gold, the Federal Government must conduct our affairs with confidence and to avoid a spending spree.

In 10 years we incurred the \$22 billion in our balance of payments was not because of any inability to pay goods overseas. Actually, U.S. exports have exceeded imports by \$22 billion during that same time. The deficit in our international balance of payments comes as a result of three things during this 10-year period—\$27 billion spent in foreign aid, another \$27 billion in military expenditures overseas, and \$22 billion in the private export of capital, \$12 billion of this \$22 billion being direct investment in foreign enterprises.

So, what is much more important than some of the things the Federal Government is trying to do is to find ways to reduce our foreign aid program, to reduce our military expenditures overseas and to stop the outflow of private capital into foreign investments. These things can be done only by taking a realistic approach to operating the Federal Government on a sound basis and on a balanced budget.

That brings me to the last point I want to discuss for just a minute—the Federal budget. At the present time, we have a national debt of about \$285 billion. That has come as a result of spending by the Federal Government in excess of its revenues in 24 out of the last 30 years.

The anticipated deficits on June 30 of this year and June 30, 1962, will increase the deficit by more than \$5 billion—to about \$290 billion.

At the present rate, the public debt will never be paid off, because we keep on increasing it instead of reducing it. It takes 11 cents out of every dollar collected from the taxpayer to pay the interest on the Federal Government's obligations.

Budget receipts for 1962 are estimated at \$82 billion, \$332 million, and expenditures at \$84 billion, \$200 million. Let's bring the Federal budget down to simple terms. Here's what it means: A family starts out a year with a debt 3½ times its annual income, and further obligates itself to spend 2½ percent more than its income anticipated for that year. In other words, the family has to get 2½ cents from somewhere to add to every dollar it earns during the year, without even attempting to reduce its debt.

You and I know what kind of credit rating that family would have and the situation our Government faces is little different. The only difference is that the Government can reach into your pocket and take out the money it wants—whether it really needs it or not.

My purpose is not to lay the blame for our economic situation at the door of either political party or of any administration. My purpose is to bring it to your attention as citizens who should let their voices be heard.

Congress and Congress alone has the power to control the expenditures of the Federal Government. Neither the President nor any official of the Government can spend one cent of money which is not approved by Congress. The citizens of this Nation must let Congress know what they want and what they don't want. Fortunately, in South Carolina, most of our Representatives and Senators have been conservative on spending. Unfortunately, they have been outnumbered by spenders in the Congress.

The citizens of this country can get what they want when they earn it. This was proved by the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin bill. It has been proved on other occasions, and it can be done again and again until the Federal Government is put on a sound basis. Communicate with your

associates and urge them to communicate with their associates; and, your Congressman with their colleagues in the Congress. Groups such as this can and do, when they become aroused, create grassroots movements which result in action by the Congress. I urge you to do so.

Time is slipping away all too quickly for those who strive to create and produce. While there is yet time, we must safeguard the principle of being our own master so that we can make our own judgments. It is not the job of Government to do this for us. Each of us must face up to the responsibility which is ours individually.

U.N. Special Fund and Tractor Deal Both Help Communist Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Communist government of Cuba is about to receive substantial assistance from the U.N. special fund, 40 percent of which is made up from U.S. contributions to the U.N. President Kennedy has just urged American citizens to contribute their money to buy the 500 tractors Castro wants as ransom for 1,214 prisoners. Humanitarian as is the appeal to the mind of the plight of these prisoners, the particular incident is but a dramatic part of a greater issue. It is estimated that the total number of people in Castro's political prisons amount to a ransom of \$1.6 billion at the tractor rate of exchange. This amount would help Castro run his Communist state for a considerable period. Is it next on the list of Castro demands? The following editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram on May 23 is pertinent to this question:

HELPING THE ENEMY

One reason the Communists do well in the cold war is that they get regular help, both intentional and unintentional, from their opposition.

Although the United States is locked in fierce combat with the Russians for supremacy in space, the Pentagon last week put its stamp of approval on the shipment to Russia of precision machinery for making ball bearings used in missiles and space craft guidance systems.

Although the United States has cut off diplomatic relations with Cuba, has labeled Cuba a Communist state, and recognizes the threat of Communist Cuba to the security of this hemisphere, a commitment has been made under which the taxpayers of the United States may support a big part of a special aid program for Cuba.

This incongruity results from the fact that the United States contributes 40 percent of the support to a special fund which, under an agreement between Castro and the United Nations, may be used to improve the economic position of Castro's Cuba.

The staff of the United Nations special fund is working on a project to help Castro diversify his agriculture and reduce his dependence on sugar production.

Thus, while Uncle Sam enforces a sugar quota policy designed to put an economic

squeeze on Cuba, the U.N. ponders using his money to help Cuba remedy the condition which makes that squeeze effective.

There are times when one does seem to be meeting oneself coming through the revolving door.

The Kingdom of Quiet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma's Third Congressional District proudly claims some of the most beautiful territory in the southwestern part of the United States. Not only are the rolling hills of southeastern Oklahoma filled with scenic beauty, but they offer a tranquillity seldom found in our busy modern lives. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor of the Tulsa Tribune, has captured the spirit of this wonderful area in an editorial entitled "The Kingdom of Quiet." Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert his article in the RECORD:

[From the Tulsa Tribune, May 6, 1961]

THE KINGDOM OF QUIET

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The world grows tighter. It is losing elbowroom. The crowds thicken in the streets. The highways choke. Suburbia crawls across the green land, gobbling fields and pushing down forests. In much of the world the farms have grown smaller as the villages bloated into towns, and the grandchildren of those who had a surplus of rice or manioc now scramble for food.

But, worst of all, the noise—the babble and bang, the screech of unwanted music, the roar of pets, the honk of horns, and blat of exhausts—all these press upon us more and more. And increasingly, we search for the shrinking oases of solitude and peace.

Well, come along to some of the grandest solitude this side of the Arctic tundra. We're in Poteau, Okla., the little capital of LeFlore County up against the western border of Arkansas. The morning sun is beginning to poke thin yellow fingers through the shade trees. It's time to get on the road.

The road is blacktopped U.S. 59 heading south. Cavanal Mountain, the great round mound that rises 1,500 feet above the town to the west, glows in the slanted sunlight. The air is crisp and clear with mist in the bottoms. And in the pastures south of town some of Senator Bob Kerr's prize-winning Black Angus cattle graze smugly, having proved that in an area of Oklahoma innocent of blue-stemmed grass, and once considered hopeless as range country, some of the best steaks and cutlets in America are produced.

Ahead, rising in blue benches toward the sky, are the Ouachita ridges.

Now, all the high land in southern Missouri, northern and western Arkansas, and southeast Oklahoma is properly the Ozark uplift. But we speak of the Ozarks as the hills lying north of the Arkansas River. The Arkansawyers describe the mountains south of the river as the Ouachitas and these run unbroken into four Oklahoma counties—LeFlore, Latimer, McCurtain, and Pushmataha. But in Oklahoma we call these mountains the Kiamichis, although properly the word belongs to a single 45-mile-long ridge lying south of Tahlequah.

1961

and contempt must we suffer from the Communist dictator?"

Representative AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, of Michigan, is appalled at the apparent eagerness of many Americans "to comply with the ransom terms laid down by Communist stooge Fidel Castro."

The issue is a highly emotional one, but countless Americans surely will echo the sentiments voiced by these Congressmen.

Justice Above Spoils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, recently in my newsletter to my constituency, I observed that the recent successful action of the House and Senate on controversial legislation requested by the Kennedy administration would indicate the number of newly authorized Federal judges has been carefully estimated and skillfully distributed throughout the country. It could be a mere coincidence, of course, that the necessary 10 or more votes to insure safe passage of the costly Kennedy bills are now available whenever the trumpet sounds. Only a few days ago it took telephone calls to Congressmen from Cabinet members, and even from the White House itself, to pass a Kennedy measure. The feeling prevailing among the conservatives is that the judgeship bill was carefully programmed after the first Kennedy legislative defeat in the House. With the pending appointment of 70 new Federal judges to use as pawns in this great game called politics, the Kennedy team can now maneuver for the votes necessary to pass almost any legislation it wants.

Therefore, I was most interested to note the following editorial which appeared in the May 11, 1961, issue of the Christian Science Monitor newspaper, entitled "Justice Above Spoils." The editorial covers another important aspect of the hurried enactment of the judgeship bill, which has been pending even before I came to Congress in 1954. The editorial follows:

JUSTICE ABOVE SPOILS

Last year Congress did not feel that any new Federal judgeships were needed. Now it has voted for 73.

The key to this sudden reversal? Partisan politics. For several years the courts have been disgracefully clogged. Last year the Judicial Conference urged 59 new judgeships to take care of increased business. But the Democrats controlling Congress didn't want President Eisenhower to have the appointments—even though he offered to name Democrats to half the new posts.

That looked like a very good opportunity to get justice out of the Federal spoils system—where both parties had too largely kept it for many years. It was lost. But President Kennedy has a chance to repair the position. In his campaign he said qualifications should be the first test for judicial appointments. Undoubtedly party leaders will put forward many deserving Democrats who also possess some qualifications for the bench. But undoubtedly also in a good

percentage of districts the best qualified man will not be a Democrat.

The partisan pressures, which caused Congress so long to neglect the needs of the courts and then to add extra judges to satisfy demands for patronage plums, will now focus on the Attorney General's office where nominations will originate.

The Attorney General happens to be both the President's brother and his campaign manager. He does not appear to be in the happiest position to satisfy at the same time political creditors and the President's qualifications-first criterion.

This is unfortunate. It underscores the need for both parties to drop the practice of placing campaign managers in the Cabinet.

But even now the final responsibility—and opportunity—rests with the White House. Congress has given John Kennedy an unprecedented opportunity to influence the Federal judiciary for good or ill. Appointments made now can decisively affect national affairs for many decades.

The President faces a major test. How he meets it can be estimated by the caliber, character—and party affiliations—of the judges he selects.

A Dangerous Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Roscoe Drummond, in his article as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 26, gives an account of the current Cuban "deal":

A DANGEROUS BUSINESS—GOVERNMENT SEEN INVOLVED IF TRACTOR DEAL IS MADE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON, May 25.—Fidel Castro estimates that the lives of two and two-tenths Cuban prisoners ought to be worth one bulldozer or one truck with spare parts. He gives the United States 10 days to come through—or else.

The fact that such Americans as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Walter Reuther, Joseph Dodge, and others, volunteer to help raise money to buy the freedom of the 1,200 Cubans who were captured during the invasion shows that the plight of the freedom fighters instinctively touches the heart and conscience of this Nation. The money is already coming in.

I am not sure this is the way to help Cuba or the United States or enslaved people anywhere. But if we are going through with it—let us recognize what we are doing, name this Castro thing for what it is and not pretend that the U.S. Government somehow has nothing to do with it.

CRUDE BLACKMAIL

This is crude, brazen, highhanded international blackmail perpetrated by a political dictator who is proposing to trade human beings for metal in order to make himself stronger.

This is a dangerous business. Once a nation yields to blackmail, where does it stop? What next? If we yield 500 trucks and bulldozers to Castro, aren't we inviting some other country to throw a few Americans in prison to trade for a dozen airplanes, a steel mill, or a low-interest loan?

There is no way whatsoever to make this Castro thing a little detached, personal deal between a few private American citizens and

somebody or other in Havana—with the Government of the United States uninvolved.

Administration officials would like to keep the Government out of it. It seems to me impossible.

After a conference at the White House Speaker SAM RAYBURN reported: "The President said the Federal Government is out of it and going to stay out of it."

Mrs. Roosevelt said: "We have the agreement of the Government. We got permission beforehand."

A CONTROVERSY?

The hard fact is that the deal cannot be brought off without some Government participation. The Logan Act makes it unlawful for private citizens to negotiate with a foreign government "with intent to influence its conduct in any disputes or controversies with the United States." President Kennedy says he is advised that the Logan Act is not involved because the people-for-tractors deal is not a controversy. But since Castro has stated that he views the tractor gift as indemnity or reparations for the invasion, there seems to me a very real controversy here.

I cannot see how the Americans can go to Havana to negotiate the prisoner-tractor arrangement without breaking the law unless they have the authority of the Government. If they have this authority, then the United States makes itself a partner to the deal.

If this deal is to be realized, as its sponsors have described it, then the United States will have to participate at four points: The Government will have to issue export licenses for the machinery, issue visas for the negotiators, authorize them to negotiate so as not to violate the Logan Act, and make contributions tax-deductible. The latter action means that the United States would be paying for part of the cost.

FULBRIGHT'S VIEWS

All this is why Senator WILLIAM J. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has said: "I agree that our Government should not in any way lend itself to this kind of blackmailing operation."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, put it this way on the floor of the Senate: "Not since the days of Hitler, when the infamous Eichmann offered to trade one Jew for one truck, has the civilized world been confronted with such a heinous barter. Would it not be far more humanitarian to exchange food and medical supplies?"

The point is that all the Cuban people, not just the captured invasion fighters, are Castro's prisoners. It seems to me that our objective and the objective of the Organization of American States should be to free the Cuban nation, not just a few of its people.

Cuba file

The Depth of Communist Penetration in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call your attention to an article which appeared in one of Florida's leading newspapers, the Palm Beach Post-Times. It was written by Jeanne Perry, and appears as one of her regular columns.

Mrs. Perry is a thorough student of Latin American affairs. She has many friends in South America, and has

A3846

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 29

traveled extensively in that region. Consequently, this article is written with authority, and is typical of her good work. I ask that it be inserted at this point.

The article follows:

LATIN AMERICAN NEWS NOTES

(By Jeanne S. Perry)

May Day in Havana was celebrated with a tremendous military parade. Tanks, sub-machine guns, and recoilless cannon were among the arms displayed. Militia units marched by. Banners with the slogans "Workers of the world unite," "Viva socialism which ends all exploitation" and "Long live communism" floated about. In the Plaza Civica Castro Red demonstrations burned President Kennedy in effigy. The latest winner of the Lenin Peace Prize delivered another marathon speech in which he promised, among other things, that all outstanding Soviet works of "literature" will be translated into Spanish for publication in Cuba.

Conditions in Havana last week were thus depicted by travelers returning from the once gay capital where 6,000 people under arrest jammed into the Blanquita (Havana's largest theater) are living in utter filth.

Official execution figures say that 7,000 persons have been killed while "unofficial" informants estimate that Ramino Valdez and Raul Castro have ordered from 3,000 to 5,000 executed.

Streets in Havana are deserted after dark except for patrols. Now arrests are being made by 14-year-olds armed with machine-guns.

The 50,000 people arrested by Castro at the start of the invasion are still in their hastily improvised jails living in indescribable conditions. Among them are many priests who were observed by the truckload going through the streets of Havana on their way to prison.

At least 50 well-known doctors have been purged from the Cuban Medical Association for counterrevolutionary activities.

The Cuban couple who gave refuge to the wife of William Morgan have been sentenced to 5 years in jail. Morgan was the ex-Castro commander who was executed in Havana last month.

Does anyone but Editorialist and Columnist Herbert Matthews of the New York Times doubt that communism is 90 miles from our shore?

President Roberto Chiari of Panama has stated that the Castro government "is totally Communist" and many Central and South American countries have severed relations with Cuba for that reason. But did you realize that it was only last week that the United States officially declared Cuba has become a member of the Communist bloc?

Even now, millions of dollars in shipments of lard continue to leave the port of Palm Beach for Cuba. Lard is the most important staple in the diet of the Cuban lower classes. Interested Members of the Senate and House were advised last fall that an embargo on lard from the United States to Cuba would render a big blow to Castro. Unfortunately, the pleas by the handful of enlightened Senators and Congressmen fell on deaf ears. A much finer example was set by the stevedores in Houston, Tex., who refused to load Russian tanks en route to Cuba very recently.

The United States is still paying \$70 million to the Communist Castro government for tobacco which is processed in Tampa, Fla.; and \$70 million buys a lot of arms and propaganda for the Fidelistas. Would it not be possible to use this sum to help the workers until Castro is toppled, or even to set up a new industry to take up the slack?

There are many ways in which the United States is helping Castro financially. To this

columnist, the most shocking item comes from a recent story in the New York Daily News. It states that Paul G. Hoffman, as head of the United Nations Special Fund, has signed an agreement whereby the Special Fund is to help Cuba get away from heavy dependence on sugar by diversifying its farm production. The United States pays about 40 percent of the Special Fund's annual budget, which stands this year at about \$47 million.

As an American who cherishes her freedom, and as a taxpayer helping to bankroll this U.N. agency, I find the signing of this agreement to give more money to Castro not only shocking but deplorable. I have expressed my sentiments in telegrams to President Kennedy, Senators SMATHERS and HOLLAND, Congressman ROGERS and others in the Senate and House of Representatives. If you agree with me please let them know your feelings also.

Americans Are Basically Conservative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress could well give some serious thought to the advice of our distinguished colleague, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, in the article from Human Events, which I herewith include as part of my remarks:

AMERICANS ARE BASICALLY CONSERVATIVE

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona)

On my way to work one morning recently the radio blared forth with a commercial for one of the Nation's largest banks. The announcer proclaimed that "this financial institution is proud of its long record of conservative management."

The same day I noticed a full-page ad of one of the Nation's largest insurance companies advising all readers that the "management of this institution is conservative and responsible."

It occurred to me to wonder how fast an insurance company would grow if it advertised its management as being "liberal." How many people would have confidence in a bank which announced that above all else it was liberal?

I would suggest that all Americans are basically conservative. We adopt a conservative philosophy in our attitude toward our children and their education. We follow conservative policies in the investment and administration of our earnings. And when we spend our money we reveal ourselves as clearly conservative by attempting to secure the greatest possible value for each dollar spent.

Most of the copybook maxims we remember are illustrations of conservative belief. We don't encourage our children to engage in wild experimentation, either in their education or their personal relationships with their fellow students. When our youngsters are old enough to drive the car, we rarely let them depart from our homes without a shouted admonition to "drive carefully." When they marry and begin building a life of their own, we encourage them to approach the purchase of such things as a home or a car cautiously, giving careful consideration to all elements involved.

It is only in the conduct of our Government that some of us espouse a liberal viewpoint. This, I suggest, is because Govern-

ment money somehow or other is now regarded as free money.

In my home State of Arizona the State building and planning commission has just received something like \$100,000 in Federal funds. This money is to be used for the planning of new public buildings and public facilities. It won't purchase the actual architectural drawings, it won't be used to buy a single brick or a single yard of concrete. It will be used instead to finance the deliberations of various committees and agencies who will explore the situation and then come up with a suggested solution.

I wonder how many people of Arizona would urge the expenditure of \$100,000 for this purpose if they were compelled to make a direct contribution on some preestablished formula to that fund.

We want our insurance companies to operate on conservative principles in order to protect the value of our own insurance policy. Yet we encourage the Government in such undertakings as social security to operate in a fashion which would bring bankruptcy to any private operator who did not have full access to the Federal Treasury.

Conservatives know the value of sound instruction in our public schools in courses devoted to what we old-fashioned folk call the solids. The liberals have just discovered that there is some value in teaching mathematics and science and history. Until the advent of the first Russian sputnik their attention was centered on the happy-life-adjustment courses, good manners, and easier methods of learning.

Isn't it time for a nation, which by instinct and by experience reaches out for conservative principles, to demand the application of this same conservative policy in the conduct of its Government? How do you stand, sir?

No Federal Aid to Education and Balancing the Budget by Curtailing New Government Programs Favored in Poll of 10th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in pointing out that the constituents of my District—10th, Illinois—have answered the public opinion poll I sent them and left no doubt that they overwhelmingly favor a balanced budget, preferring this to any expansion of new Federal programs. Seventy-three percent of those who answered the poll favor balancing the budget by cutting down on new Federal activities. I submit that this is a sizable percentage.

Those polled also definitely oppose measures aimed at granting Federal aid-to-education activities. Forty-eight percent favor loans only for school districts that are unable to provide adequate standards of education.

I am convinced that complete results of the poll, which follow, provide interesting reading:

1961

FEDERAL MARSHALS TO ALABAMA

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's action in sending Federal marshals into Alabama warrants our complete support. Federal officers were sent to insure the maintenance and enforcement of Federal law. Under the circumstances no other choice could be made.

The administration has stated that an 1871 law served as the legal basis for its action. That Federal statute authorizes the President to take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection or domestic violence. The President's action was prompted by patent denials of the rights of citizens to travel freely and without harm. State and local authorities were apparently unwilling or unable to protect those rights.

I stand firmly in support of the action taken by the Federal Government to meet this disgraceful situation. It is now doubly clear, however, that we must have new legislation arming the Attorney General with the legal tools necessary to initiate court actions where civil rights have been violated. There is, under existing law, legal basis to prevent obstruction of interstate commerce, but the Federal Government does not have the sanctions which it ought to have in order to prevent and to punish willful denials of the right of peaceful assembly, or of free and equal access to publicly supported institutions, or other constitutionally protected rights not necessarily tried to interstate commerce.

Some time ago I introduced legislation which would authorize the Attorney General to initiate civil injunctive proceedings against persons who willfully and discriminatorily deprive any person or groups of persons of their right to the equal protection of the laws. Such proceedings could likewise prevent hindrances to Federal officials from carrying out orders of the court.

There must be no doubt or equivocation, as there is now, about the authority of the Federal Government with respect to all constitutionally protected rights.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I must again request legislative action. Legislation is long overdue and we have a right to expect that the administration will support it, consistent with its platform.

TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

(Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in the National Capital we have reason to be constantly aware of the great work being done in the education of the deaf. The Maryland School for the Deaf in Frederick, Md., and Gallaudet College in the District of Columbia are both adding many useful new citizens to our communities each year. But the prob-

lems of this special branch of education threaten to reduce its rewards. An attack is now being made on those problems.

On March 3, 1961, the U.S. Senate passed a bill to provide for trained teachers for children handicapped by hearing defects. Companion bills are currently pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor with no action scheduled.

Today, I have introduced a bill which is identical to the bill which passed the Senate. This bill provides for an annual payment of \$1.5 million for 2 years and such other sums as may be required for an additional 8 years for educational costs and scholarships for teachers of the deaf.

The bill also establishes for a 10-year program for educational costs and scholarships for speech pathologists and audiologists at institutions of higher education that provide the comprehensive training needed to train teachers for deaf children.

I hope that the Committee on Education and Labor will give early consideration to this legislation and recommend passage by the House.

It is impossible to estimate how many children would benefit by this bill. There are, however, over 26,500 students enrolled in classes for deaf persons. All of these students became deaf before they acquired language. A qualified teacher can enable these children to obtain various skills of communication due to the great ability of all these children to learn. The amount of success obtained in teaching speech skills to these children is primarily dependent on the professional ability and training of the child's teacher. In 1954, the U.S. Office of Education reported that teachers of the deaf ranked first in "difficulty of securing" and there is no indication that this need has lessened.

Current estimates place the number of individuals with significant speech and hearing impediments at 9 million. Less than one-half of the 7,000 speech pathologists and audiologists have the training necessary to be certified by a professional accrediting organization.

The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has estimated that 27,300 competent professional teachers are needed. Twenty thousand of these are needed to train children. To train our school children alone we need to train 1,500 speech pathologists and audiologists each year for 10 years and presently we are training less than 400 per year. These numbers include teachers of the deaf only and do not include personnel needed for research nor personnel needed to train the teacher.

The bill is supported by the National Council on the Education of the Deaf. This council is made up of three organizations directly concerned with education of the deaf, the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, the Conference on Executives of American Schools for the Deaf, and the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, Inc. I hope that the House will have the opportunity to consider this bill in the near future.

WHAT POLICY WITH CUBA?

Mr. CASEY (at the request of Mr. HALEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, there was a time—not long ago—when no pip-squeak dictator would have dared demand tribute from the United States.

And there was a time—not long ago—when no American would have dared suggest that we follow the shoddy road of appeasement.

But this is the era of do-gooders and fuzzy thinkers. And what a hollow mockery recent events are making of this once proud Nation.

The few short years I have been privileged to serve as a Member of Congress have filled me with growing alarm for the future of our Nation. I cannot help but echo the cry of those Americans who try to follow and understand the tortuous reasoning of our Government in foreign affairs: "What, in the name of all that is Holy, is going on?"

I ask the Members of this House to stop and consider these facts:

First. For the past 6 months, perhaps longer, the Central Intelligence Agency was spending a reported \$45 million to finance the abortive overthrow of Castro.

Second. Our Government is engaged in persuading our reluctant friends in the Organization of American States to impose sanctions on this bloody dictator.

Third. On May 24, 1961—just last week—the Governing Council of the United Nations Special Fund voted to send Castro \$1,147,000 in technical aid and assistance, of which the United States voluntarily contributes 40 percent.

We spend some \$45 million to overthrow Castro—and the U.N. sends him half a million dollars of our money in aid. Now, we are engaged in trying to buy back our self-respect with \$15 million worth of tractors.

I am fully aware, Mr. Speaker, that this great civic effort has the backing of the President of the United States, and of many Members of Congress. I know, too, that many citizens feel that it is humane, and are willing to swallow their pride and bow to Casto's demands.

Well, I am not. And I do not think the majority of Americans are.

Such action establishes a precedent and opens the door for every smalltime dictator to demand tribute. Who will be next to levy such a demand upon this Nation?

But is it any wonder that this comic opera dictator dares to tweak the eagle's beak?

Is it any wonder that this Nation is becoming the laughingstock of the world?

Certainly, I feel sorry for the plight of the 1,200 Cubans held at prisoners. But what about the American prisoners that he holds. Or those reputed to be held by Red China—Russia? Or the property Castro seized in Cuba from Americans and American firms?

I hear no offer ringing through this land to buy tractors to free the forgotten Americans now in Communist jails. I

hear of no great civic undertaking to reimburse those whose property was stolen. I doubt that any Member of this House would dare face the disabled veterans of Korea—or those ex-prisoners of war who languished for endless months in Communist compounds—with the lame excuse that paying tribute to Castro is the humanitarian thing to do.

It would, indeed, be humane to free the Cuban people from the despot's heel. We could, if we so chose, starve him out of power. We could burn him out. Or we could blast him out.

Instead, our friends in the United Nations—whose loyalty we supposedly bought over the years with billions of taxpayers money—vote instead to try and smother him with dollars. Our dollars, I might add.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy stood before this Congress and said:

The Congress and the American people are entitled to know that we will institute whatever new organization, policies and control are necessary to insure the maximum coordination and use of all political, economic and psychological resources in the attainment of our objective.

Mr. Speaker, I have faith in the ability of the President to carry out his statement to the fullest.

But let this House remember that it, too, has a responsibility to the American people. I do not believe that this Congress should sit idly by while the fate of our Nation hangs in the balance, and a handful of bureaucrats and our international friends are busy sawing at the thread.

The law of averages, Mr. Speaker, would have it that our decisions in the field of foreign affairs would be right and consistent at least half the time. I cannot believe that we are consistently wrong by accident. We have suffered constant and humiliating defeats in our cold war efforts. Our inconsistencies are beyond belief. Stop and consider:

We spend money to destroy a dictator at the same time we are spending money to support his regime in power. And as an act of contribution for our attempts to bring liberty and freedom to an enslaved people, we send him \$15 million in tribute.

We are engaged in a deadly battle with communism. We spend billions to thwart its expansion. At the same time, we are sending hundreds of millions in aid to Communist nations to help them grow stronger in the battle against us.

We refuse to recognize Red China or to trade with her. Yet our closest allies—to whom we opened wide our treasury in their darkest hour of need—find the glitter of gold more rewarding than principle. They carry on a lavish and growing trade with one of our most deadly enemies.

Mr. Speaker, the alarm bells are ringing over this Nation—and the signposts of our folly are scattered over the world for all to read. I urge that the Members and appropriate Committees of this Congress heed the warning and take appropriate action:

First. If there are those within the Department of State, the CIA, our United Nations delegations, our agen-

cies and our bureaus whose inadequate and reckless decisions are our stumbling blocks—they should be removed quickly.

Second. If there are those within our Government whose cold and calculated decisions are made with the full knowledge and intent to destroy our Nation—they should be rooted out and prosecuted.

The action taken by the United Nations Special Fund last week is one of many examples of our ridiculous policy, and of taxpayers money being used against the best interests of this Nation.

It is my intention to vigorously oppose the appropriation of funds in certain portions of the Department of State bill later this week.

When this bill is before the House, I hope to submit statistics showing the American people being bled to death to support the United Nations and a host of international groups and organizations—for we are assessed or voluntarily give far more than Russia and all of the satellites behind the Iron Curtain.

I strongly urge the appropriate committees of this Congress to investigate our entire participation and fiscal support of the U.N. and the international groups in which we participate.

The American people have a right to know why we bear 32.5 percent of the cost—while Russia and nine satellite nations are assessed 18.97 percent to support the U.N.

I urge the Members of this body to heed the warning from their constituents, who I know must share the same alarm as those I represent, and that they press for appropriate investigation by the House.

To those Americans who feel they must donate to the tribute fund to a bloody-handed dictator—I can only say that we should have learned by now that money cannot buy self-respect any more than it can buy friendship. But used in this fashion, it can buy shame for a nation, and for those Americans, who do not deserve it.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. HOSMER for 30 minutes today and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LESINSKI (at the request of Mr. Boggs) and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the estimated cost is \$243.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an address by the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN.

Mr. HUDDLESTON in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HEBERT and to include a resolution adopted by the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans.

Mr. ULLMAN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROWN and to include an editorial from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News Post entitled "Where Has the Prestige of the United States Gone?"

Mr. SPRINGER in two instances, in each to include editorials.

Mr. HOSMER in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. HALEY) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRUCE in two instances.

Mr. DEROUNIAN in three instances.

Mr. BROYHILL.

Mr. ELLSWORTH in four instances.

Mr. WEAVER in five instances.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. JONAS.

Mr. GIALMO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Boggs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. McMILLAN.

Mr. GARMATZ in two instances.

Mr. ANFUSO in three instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia in two instances.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 529. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

S. 537. An act to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 538. An act to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 539. An act to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 540. An act to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 541. An act to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 798. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 880. An act to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to

May 29

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Applications for initial operating and farm ownership loans, 1961 fiscal year through Apr. 30

State	Operating loans		Farm ownership loans		State	Operating loans		Farm ownership loans	
	Applica- tions received	Applica- tions on hand Apr. 30, 1961	Applica- tions received	Applica- tions on hand Apr. 30, 1961		Applica- tions received	Applica- tions on hand Apr. 30, 1961	Applica- tions received	Applica- tions on hand Apr. 30, 1961
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
U.S. total.....	58,969	6,363	17,239	9,875	Montana.....	765	97	231	100
Alabama.....	2,666	132	637	325	Nebraska.....	796	93	270	302
Alaska.....	121	6	4	2	Nevada.....	79	31	17	7
Arizona.....	156	13	31	13	New Hampshire.....	109	14	31	11
Arkansas.....	2,835	162	934	232	New Jersey.....	262	32	69	26
California.....	478	79	159	67	New Mexico.....	443	34	121	45
Colorado.....	508	50	186	136	New York.....	1,570	262	350	157
Connecticut.....	62	13	15	5	North Carolina.....	3,473	143	1,114	717
Delaware.....	29	6	10	8	North Dakota.....	1,747	288	908	751
Florida.....	589	26	194	107	Ohio.....	982	144	385	204
Georgia.....	1,599	136	711	561	Oklahoma.....	1,717	218	499	309
Hawaii.....	94	13	23	29	Oregon.....	1,023	76	120	64
Idaho.....	1,107	114	216	106	Pennsylvania.....	1,054	240	344	170
Illinois.....	1,552	210	344	148	Rhode Island.....	2,142	81	377	191
Indiana.....	2,884	160	385	208	South Carolina.....	1,103	105	278	239
Iowa.....	2,284	291	441	190	South Dakota.....	1,566	174	741	438
Kansas.....	751	108	336	301	Tennessee.....	5,049	192	501	388
Kentucky.....	1,839	190	636	395	Texas.....	425	107	137	100
Louisiana.....	1,755	106	342	226	Utah.....	225	44	87	33
Maine.....	503	125	165	61	Virginia.....	920	124	405	167
Maryland.....	260	55	41	26	Washington.....	1,301	108	463	184
Massachusetts.....	95	12	20	6	West Virginia.....	735	146	323	117
Michigan.....	1,513	241	269	135	Wisconsin.....	1,615	434	744	294
Minnesota.....	2,480	359	682	263	Wyoming.....	223	39	59	31
Mississippi.....	2,971	241	656	467	Puerto Rico.....	576	107	242	248
Missouri.....	1,909	201	916	556	Virgin Islands.....	7	0	2	5

LATIN AMERICAN REACTION TO
CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as time goes on the wisdom of the President of the United States in supporting the exchange of Cuban prisoners for tractors through a privately organized committee becomes more and more apparent. Equally apparent is the futility of the Republican opposition to this move. I say in all fairness I do not refer to all Republicans, but only to a group which has attacked the President bitterly on the floor during the last few days.

The New York Times of Sunday contained a heartening story based on a careful survey of Latin American reaction to the President's proposal and that of the distinguished committee headed by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Mr. Walter Reuther, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower. I think the result, in good will throughout Latin America for the United States of America, by reason of the proposed exchange, has been one of the most heartening things that has happened in recent weeks. We did suffer a setback in connection with the Cuban invasion, but this proposed exchange of prisoners for tractors is rehabilitating our position in Latin America in a way that no other recent act has done.

I heartily commend the President and the members of the committee for their courage in taking up this most worthwhile venture.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Memorial Day, 1961, holds a special significance for Americans and is the ideal time for all of us to pause for a moment and renew our pledge of allegiance to this Nation and the millions of her citi-

zens who have made the supreme sacrifice in the cause of freedom.

This Memorial Day is especially significant because it comes at a period in our history when the United States is faced with more challenges, and, at the same time, more opportunities for achievement than ever before.

Americans have trod together a crisis-strewn path since Memorial Day, 1960. We have shared a restless and uncertain peace during the last 12 months. We have linked hands, hearts, and determination in the face of many provocations and threats from forces bent on destroying our way of life and stealing from us the freedoms and rights we enjoy as Americans.

Peace in the world is what we all hope for. The right to remain freemen in a democratic society is what we will all fight for, and if necessary, die for, as did those millions of vallant Americans to whom we pay tribute on Memorial Day.

Mr. President, tomorrow is the day when many Members of the Senate and many other governmental officials all over the Nation will be aiding citizens in many villages, towns, cities, and communities in paying tribute to the valor of Americans of past generations. I should like for us to pause a moment to remember that our President will be leaving tomorrow in his quest for freedom, peace, and security, not merely for the people of the United States, but also for all men everywhere. I know that as we pause, tomorrow will be not merely another holiday, but a day of rededication for Americans. I think the President takes with him on his trip the best wishes of all Americans that from these conferences and from the great task he has set for himself will come a more

secure, a freer, and safer America, as well as a safer free world.

And so, on Memorial Day, 1961, I ask all Americans to join with me in a pledge to work harder than hard and longer than long and with a new vigor to promote the principles of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

I personally shall have the privilege of visiting tomorrow with the Maryland Civil War Centennial Commission on the battlefield of Antietam, at which Texas regiments served east of the Mississippi, and engaged in battle in September of 1862. It was Hood's Brigade of Texans, from my own State, which participated in the great struggle that day at Antietam, or Sharpsburg which saw more men lose their lives than in any other single day of the great Civil War, which so bled this country. It was that brigade which reached the deepest penetration of the Union lines, and a young lieutenant from my own hometown of Tyler, Tex., named Robert Gaston, made the deepest penetration into the Union lines. He was killed there, and his body was found further inside the Union lines than any other Confederate soldier. As a tribute to his courage, instead of burying him in a multiple grave with the other soldiers, the Union boys in blue dug a separate heroes grave for him, in which he was buried alone. Such was the tribute valor paid to valor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized an additional 2 minutes to make a statement on the cold war GI bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

clear-testing ban. According to the Soviet proposal, the members of this council would consist of a representative of the Communist bloc, one from the West, and a neutral. Each would have a veto over inspections or any of the operations of the council.

We believe that such a three-man council, operating with a veto, cancels out the very purpose of control.

American public opinion, in our view, would not and should not support any agreements to suspend nuclear testing if the inspection system rested on a veto.

In the United States, the test ban talks at Geneva are regarded as the proving ground for good intentions. What happens in Geneva is regarded as a key to any hopes of progress toward effective disarmament.

In the past the Soviet Union made concessions at the Geneva talks indicating a desire for agreement.

The purpose of this letter, therefore, is to emphasize the importance attached by Americans to an inspected ban on nuclear explosions, and to express the hope that the Soviet Union will reconsider, modify, or withdraw its present proposal without delay.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE PICKETT,

NORMAN COUSINS,

Cochairmen, National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

FARM CREDIT EMERGENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent months this country has been faced with a wide variety of economic disruptions. Literally millions of words have been expended on various aspects of this highly unfortunate situation. Fortunately, as the President noted yesterday, significant improvement has been noted during the past several weeks, particularly in our rising level of industrial production.

However, one aspect of this economic picture which remains a serious problem is the credit emergency facing the average farmer. Although this crisis has been growing for years, it has received little notice by the general public, and the fundamental reasons for this emergency are generally not understood. Now the situation is critical. Many farmers simply cannot secure the loans they need to continue in business. Private lenders find farm operating, farm ownership, and soil and water conservation loans unattractive. The Farmers Home Administration—the Federal agency charged with providing loans under such circumstances—is unable to assist these credit-starved farmers. Why? All funds available to the FHA have been exhausted for months.

Even though FHA funds were exhausted well before the end of fiscal 1961, the Department of Agriculture has not requested an increase in loan authorizations for 1962. Since a great backlog of loan applications currently exists, it is likely that another credit shortage will develop even more rapidly in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. President, to highlight this situation further, I ask unanimous consent

that my statement on the farm credit emergency recently filed with the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE SENATE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON FUNDS FOR FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, FISCAL YEAR 1962

Mr. Chairman, I wish to include in the record a statement on the farm credit emergency facing our farming population from coast to coast. Of course, I am intimately aware of the situation in Minnesota and I know that unless some relief is forthcoming in the coming fiscal year, the plight of the family farmer in my State will be a very grave one.

But this is not merely a localized condition. From coast to coast, farmers are unable to obtain necessary credit because Farmers Home Administration funds are exhausted and private lenders will not assume increased obligations at interest rates which farmers can afford. I am including in this statement a table indicating by States the applications for initial operating and farm ownership loans for fiscal 1961 through April 30, 1961. On that date FHA had 16,238 applications on hand which could not be processed due to a lack of available funds. As of March 31, 1961, FHA also had on hand 633 applications for soil and water conservation loans. It is clear that this substantial backlog in each category will consume most of the 1962 funds before the year is half over.

This emergency has been coming for a number of years. It results from a number of conditions over which the family farmer has no control. It is time we reexamined the reasons for this shortage of farm credit. It is time we moved to provide an adequate remedy.

The amount of capital that a farmer needs in order to stay in business today is staggering. Farm production expenses have risen from \$6 billion to \$26 billion in the last 20 years. Production expenses per farm have climbed from \$1,063 to \$5,794 over that same period. In other words, since 1940 farmers production expenses have increased 600 percent. The average value of productive assets per farm has also risen from \$6,094 in 1940 to \$34,648 in 1960, nearly another six-fold increase.

What accounts for these dramatic increases? During these years the farmer mechanized his operations; he adopted a variety of new farming techniques. While every American takes pride in the great productivity of our agricultural plant, we must also recognize that this technological revolution on the farm has radically increased the average farmers credit problems.

The cost of modernizing this operation has placed the average farmer heavily in debt. If he had any financial reserves, the cost-price squeeze has often wiped them out. Thousands of farmers face a need for continuing operations that eat up huge amounts of capital before they return a dime. Thousands face a need for further expansion of their operations, for further improvements, and for replacement of worn-out equipment. The financial condition of the family farmer has deteriorated to the point where many no longer have the equities or the margin of

profit required to obtain adequate conventional financing to meet these needs.

The Farmers Home Administration was created to help farmers in difficult credit situations such as I have described. But now we find that FHA also lacks the lending resources to help the distressed family farmer. For example, take the operating loan funds. These are the funds used to buy equipment, livestock, fertilizer, and similar operating needs. The \$232 million provided for this year is exhausted and it has been gone for sometime. Yet \$232 million is the budget estimate for next year. Since the current backlog has been estimated at \$20 million, I suggest that \$300 million is the minimum amount needed for fiscal 1962.

Even this figure might prove to be insufficient. I believe if farmers knew they could count upon obtaining the credit they needed from FHA, and if they knew this in the summer and fall, they would request substantially more than the present budget estimates. And these would be farmers to whom loans could be soundly made, who should stay on their farms, and who cannot get credit from other conventional sources.

A similar situation applies to farm ownership loan funds. These funds are used to develop farms, to enlarge farms, to acquire farms, and to refinance debts. The 1962 budget provides \$31.9 million for farm ownership loans, the same amount as 1961. But this money was gone before the year was half over. If the entire amount could have been allocated among the States according to need, the \$31.9 million would have been gone even sooner. At present there exists an authorized limit of \$50 million for ownership loans. Surely this amount should be provided for 1962. If legislation now being considered is enacted to remove this \$50 million ceiling, higher amounts should be seriously considered.

The current backlog of soil and water conservation loans is \$3.5 million. The 1961 appropriation, \$3 million, is again proposed for 1962.

Although the soil and water conservation loan program is relatively new, it has made an outstanding record. As farmers become better acquainted with the program, it is reasonable to expect increased requests for funds. I, for one, know of few situations offering more worthwhile investment opportunities than soil and water conservation. I recommend a minimum of \$15 million be provided in this category.

Farmers are currently using \$25 billion of Government credit from a number of sources. From this perspective, the funds requested by the Farmers Home Administration are small indeed. Moreover, the FHA loans go to family farmers and they go to those farmers most in need. The good they will do is far greater than the level of funds required to do an adequate job. I must also emphasize these funds will be repaid. The losses on previous loans are negligible.

This is a critical situation. If we can't help our family farmers get the funds they need to continue their operations, we invite the multiplication of other problems. Our urban crisis is directly linked to the disappearance of the family farm. Unemployment, poverty, delinquency, and crime will grow as farmer after farmer leaves the soil and joins the ranks of those out of work, out of hope, and out of faith.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.